DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 586 UD 027 731

TITLE 1989 National Priorities Report.
INSTITUTION National Urban League, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Community; Community Organizations; *Community Programs; National Organizations; *National Programs; National Surveys; *Needs Assessment; *Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS *African Americans; *National Urban League

ABSTRACT

This report presents rankings of major program areas and subareas of concern to African Americans based on responses to a questionnaire completed in February 1989 by local chapters of the National Urban League. The local chapters rank the areas according to needs in their community and priority for the Urban League Movement. This information is gathered annually to ensure local Urban League input into the national body's planning process and to enable the community to receive its fair share of United Way support. In addition to the rankings, the report includes analyses of United Way allocations, the labor market situation, and a discussion of the program areas. The Urban League priorities for 1989 are: (1) Education; (2) Employment and Training; (3) Housing; (4) Civil Rights; (5) Economic Development; (6) Health; (7) Social Welfare; (8) Crime/Criminal Justice; (9) Community Organization; (10) Citizenship Education; (11) Energy; and (12) Environment. The six leading subareas for 1989 are: Family Communication; Parenting Education; and Support Services; Teenage Pregnancy; Low Income Energy Assistance; Networking; Juvenile Delinquency; and Voter Registration. Lists of participating affiliates and 12 tables showing the national and regional tallies are included. (DM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325586

National Urban League, Inc.

1989 DELEGATE ASSEMBLY
1989 NUL ANNUAL CONFERENCE
August 5, 1989
Washington, DC

1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kenneth Small
National Urban League
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

UD 027 731

Prepared By:

The National Planning and Evaluation Dept.

JULY, 1989

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development of the 1989 National Priorities Report would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of several parties. I would like to extend a most humble thank you to all the affiliates who supplied input to this report through the submission of their Affiliate Priorities Questionnaire or the report. Thanks must also be extended to the staff of the Regional Service Centers for the assistance provided in the submission of priorities materials. In addition, I wish to extend my thanks to the staff of and volunteers to the National Planning and Evaluation Department (NPED) who were responsible for the compilation and production of this report. Analysis was provided by Mr. Kenneth Small, Executive Assistant for Strategic Planning, and Mr. Daniel Clark, Research Assistant. Ms. Patricia Cooper, a volunteer consultant, provided additional technical support. Layout and design responsibilities were performed by Mrs. Vanessa E. Watson, Administrative Assistant, and Mrs. Marie Baxter, Clerk-Typist.

Mildred L. Love
Vice President
Office of Programs
and Field Services
National Urban League, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	1
PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM	2
DISTRIBUTION PROCESS	3
MODIFICATIONS	3
SUPPLEMENT	4
HOW DOES THE PRIORITIES ANALYSIS RELATE TO NUL PLANNING ACTIVITIES?	4
DISCUSSION	5
A. UNITED WAY ALLOCATION ANALYSIS	6
B. LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS	7
C. ANALYSIS OF PRIORITIES	9
D. SUB-AREAS ANALYSIS	11
E. BROAD AREAS FOR ADOPTION	14
AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT	15
CENTRAL REGION	16
EASTERN REGION	17
SOUTHERN REGION	18
WESTERN REGION	19
APPENDICES	20
T-1: National Tally For Community Needs, 1989	21
T-2: National Tally For Urban League Rankings, 1989	22

T- 3:	Central Region, Final Tally On Community Needs, 1989.....	23
T- 4:	Central Region, Final Tally On Urban League Rankings, 1989 ..	24
T- 5:	Eastern Region, Final Tally On Community Needs, 1989	25
T- 6:	Eastern Region, Final Tally On Urban League Rankings, 1989 ..	26
T- 7:	Southern Region, Final Tally On Community Needs, 1989	27
T- 8:	Southern Region, Final Tally On Urban League Rankings, 1989 .	28
T- 9:	Western Region, Final Tally On Community Needs, 1989	29
T-10:	Western Region, Final Tally On Urban League Rankings, 1989 ..	30
T-11:	The Leading Sub-Areas For 1989	31
T-12:	1989 National Priority Rankings, Urban League Priority Rankings By Broad Area And Sub-Area	32-35

1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

INTRODUCTION

After several years of reviewing the Delegate Assembly process, the National Urban League's Planning and Evaluation Department developed a uniform and credible priority setting system in 1983 which helped establish program priorities for fiscal year 1984-85. Modifications have been made in the system's data collection instrument since that time to increase the validity of the data. This year affiliates were asked to follow two (2) steps in the establishment of priorities for the fiscal year 1990-91 or calendar year 1990.

1. Conduct a formal or informal needs assessment of program/methodology areas with their boards, staff, and other community organizations, and members of target populations.

2. Use this assessment to rank these areas and their sub-areas on the instrument provided by the National

   Planning and Evaluation Department, the 1989 Delegate Assembly Planning and Priorities Setting Questionnaire.

METHODOLOGY

The 1989 Delegate Assembly Planning and Priorities Setting Questionnaire is composed of two sections, one for broad program\methodology areas (i.e., Education) and the other for sub-areas within each broad area (i.e., Remedial and Basic Skills Tutoring). Affiliates are asked to rank consecutively broad areas of service in terms of community needs and Urban League priority. (A ranking in terms of United Way priority was eliminated because of methodological and definitional differences in how United Way priorities are determined.)

Utilizing the NUL's Office of Programs and Field Services categorization of sub-area service groups within these areas, a ranking of sub-areas within broad areas is sought to assess their priority within a given broad area and relative to all sub-areas.

These sub-areas rankings permit the Urban League Movement to identify specific population groups or issues in need of attention. Revisions to the sub-areas contained under Social Welfare, Housing, Health and Crime were made in 1987 to ensure the process continues to identify key target populations and relevant issues. In addition, Civil Rights was added as a major program area to reflect changes in the nation overall and within the Urban League Movement in particular. Advocacy, added to the rankings in 1986, has been deleted.

PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM

A priorities ranking system is used to rank both broad areas and the sub-areas within them. For the broad areas, a twelve-point ranking scale was established. Areas are to be ranked consecutively from one to twelve with one as the top priority, two the second highest priority, and so on. If an area is of no priority to an affiliate, it is to be assigned the rank of zero.

Regional priorities are established by assigning points to the number of affiliates awarding a particular area a certain rank. A twelve-point rating/weighing system is used to calculate the area rank, i.e., twelve points for a one rank, eleven points for a two rank, and so on. Once the points are tallied, they are weighted by multiplying by the percentage of affiliates ranking that area.

The procedure for ranking the sub-areas is similar. Each sub-area within a particular broad area is ranked from high to low and then weighed by an adjustment factor before it is multiplied by the percentage of affiliates ranking that sub-area. The adjustment factor permits us to adjust for changes in the size of broad area sub-categories, as well as permit sub-area comparisons across broad areas. This permits the identification of key issues or target groups within a broad area which may be deemed low priority.

The adjustment factors are calculated as follows. Each broad area contains a percentage of the total number of sub-areas (81). The adjustment factor for each area is the reciprocal of this amount. This allows the factor to cancel out variations between sub-areas due to variations in the number of sub-areas contained in a broad area. Hence, the sub-areas of Health (9) have the same weight as those of Energy (5).

DISTRIBUTION PROCESS

In January 1989 each affiliate chief executive officer was mailed the 1989 Delegate Assembly Planning and Priorities Setting Questionnaire, accompanied by a memorandum which was also sent to board chairpersons. (Board chairpersons who requested the questionnaire were provided one.) February 27, 1989 was the deadline for their completion and submission to NPED. Follow-up via written reminder and telephone communication was conducted with affiliates who missed the deadline. The Office of Programs and Field Services and the Regional Service Centers provided considerable support to the follow-up effort.

MODIFICATIONS

Since the development and implementation of the current priorities setting process, a number of affiliate chief executive officers have expressed concern about the repetitive nature of the process. Because affiliates are asked to review their priorities every year, it has been noted that conditions do not change substantially from one year to the next and this absence of substantial change could be a factor in nonparticipation by some affiliates. In an effort to address this concern, the priorities setting process was modified in 1987 and the modifications remain in effect this year.

Affiliates were asked to complete a Priorities Questionnaire Tear Sheet in lieu of the 1989 Affiliate Priorities Questionnaire when their priorities did not change. All affiliates, however, were encouraged to spend time engaged in the review of the questionnaire in order to assure the accuracy of the data compiled. In addition, affiliates were reminded of the importance of priorities setting activities in relation to United Way support. The seriousness that affiliates apply to the priorities setting process can help the national organization build its case for greater affiliate support from the funding body. Without an accurate database, the national organization has little basis for its argument.

SUPPLEMENT

The 1989 Regional and National Priorities Reports feature supplements on United Way allocations and the employment status of African Americans. The United Way supplement is included to undergird the importance of affiliate support from the funding body. Data contained in the reports was provided by the United Way of America's Research Department. Labor force data is included to provide a regional perspective on the changing composition of the workforce and the persistence of high unemployment among African Americans. Both supplements should be used along with priorities analysis itself to help in the creation of advocacy, policy, program, and research activities.

HOW DOES THE PRIORITIES ANALYSIS RELATE TO NUL PLANNING ACTIVITIES?

The National and Regional Priorities Reports are designed to help ensure local Urban League input into the National Urban League's planning process. The priorities analysis contained herein provides the staff and management of the National Urban League a sound basis for program development, research, and technical assistance activities. While the priorities analysis is seldom the sole determinant of action by the agency, it frequently provides the National Urban League a quantifiable basis for action. In 1985, for example, Priorities Report data on the affiliate network's technical assistance needs provided the agency's Training Department with hard data on affiliate training needs. (In 1986, the findings of the Affiliate Assessment Study provided similar data for both training and targeted technical assistance efforts.) The 1986 Priorities Reports demonstrated the impact of the Delegate Assembly-mandated Education Initiative, as it documented a substantial reduction in the gap between Employment and Training and Education, the Movement's top ranked program area. The 1987 reports were of considerable assistance to the League in the development of a paper on the Movement's relationship with the United Way, an issue that reached its culmination at the 1987 Mid-Winter Meeting. The data on small business enterprises contained in the 1988 report has been used to assist the national organization with it fundraising activities.

The Priorities Reports, combined with the Delegate Assembly resolutions, provide affiliates with formal inputs into the agency's planning process. Informal inputs include the Mid-Winter Meeting, the ongoing dialogue with the Council of Executives and desires conveyed through the Regional Service Centers. All these inputs, formal and informal, help lay the foundation for discussions which occur at the agency's annual Planning Session in October. The outgrowth of this session is the development or modification of the agency's environmental analysis, organizational appraisal report, strategic plan, action plan, and individual unit action plans.

The National and Regional Priorities Reports and their source document, the Delegate Assembly Planning and Priorities Setting Questionnaire, are clearly valuable tools in the National Urban League's efforts to better realize the primary mandates of advocacy, services to the field, and research and policy development. Their use, however, should not be limited to compliance with headquarter's request for information. The data contained within the reports should prove to be valuable tools or affiliate planning efforts as well because they provide a solid methodological and program development base. The data contained in these reports could be used to help lay the foundation for a variety of local or regional efforts. The Office of Programs and Field Services and the Planning Department of the National Urban League encourage affiliates in all regions to make more extensive use of the Priorities Reports in such efforts.

DISCUSSION

The discussion section of the 1989 Priorities Reports constitutes their substance. Contained in the discussion are three sub-sections. The first is an analysis of United Way allocations between 1983 and 1987. The second is a labor market analysis. The final sub-section is an analysis of major program areas and key sub-areas within them. In all sub-sections, data are in the aggregate. Affiliate-specific data can be obtained from the Planning Department.

A. UNITED WAY ALLOCATION ANALYSIS

Data provided by the Research Department of the United Way of America reveals that reported allocations to Urban League affiliates increased 34 percent between 1983 and 1987, from twenty million dollars to $26.8 million. While this $6.8 million increase is impressive, it masks the fact that 53 affiliates had their allocation percentage reduced over the four year period. In contrast, only 37 affiliates had their allocation percentage increased. (The remaining affiliates for which data is available had their percentage held constant.)

The allocation percentage, rather than the allocation amount, is often a more accurate measure of United Way support. While the allocation amount is important for affiliate basic program and administrative operations, the allocation percentage is a more accurate measure of where an affiliate stands relative to other institutions. This distinction is also important because many United Ways are now raising significantly higher amounts of revenue support than in previous years. It is important that community based organizations such as the Urban League affiliate network receive their fair share of these increased revenues. A reduced allocation percentage suggests that they do not.

In nominal terms, the 53 affiliates that had their allocation percentage reduced between 1983 and 1987 witnessed an increase in funding of $1.78 million. Had their allocation percentage remained constant, the increase would have been $3.22 million, more than four-fifths the actual increase. This suggests the need for a continued dialogue with the United Way to assure that the affiliate network receives an equitable proportion of increased revenue.

From the perspective of the Urban League, assurances of equitable treatment from the United Way is a function of affiliate performance. Affiliates that are well-managed and have a high degree of credibility in their communities are in a better position to receive greater United Way support than those who are not. It is not simply enough for affiliates to stake a claim for greater support. Affiliates must demonstrate a track record which justifies it. As a rule, those who have demonstrated exemplary performance have been rewarded with greater support from the United Way and other sources. While such support may be inadequate in the face of overwhelming community needs, it does suggest that solid management practices be given consideration in the Movement's push for greater equity with the United Way.

It is also equally important that affiliates give serious attention to their program planning and needs analysis activities. The United Way attaches a high priority to its program planning and needs analysis activities because they provide the rationale for allocations. The unfortunate reality is that many affiliates do not possess mechanisms to determine the needs of their constituents and consequently can not create a program of servies to address those needs. If this Movement is to secure United Way funding for the Urban League's constituents, we must develop a greater capacity to document the needs of that constituency. This requires serious planning, needs analysis, and investigation of the community we purport to serve. When this is done, the Movement will possess a rationale for support that supersedes those of other institutions. Such a rationale will enable the Movement to receive its fair share of United Way support regardless of their reported priority service areas.

B. LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS

Data from the Local Area Unemployment Statistics project of the Cooperative Services program of the United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 1987 reveals that unemployment remains a major problem in the African American community. Despite the continuation of economic growth overall, African Americans remain locked in the vise of unemployment more than their white counterparts.

Data for the 34 states served by local affiliates revealed that the overall 1987 unemployment rate was 6.1 percent. The overall rate for whites was a significantly lower 5.3 percent, while the overall rate for African Americans was a recession-like 12.9 percent. Black males had an unemployment rate that was nearly twice that of their white counterparts (13.0 percent to 5.3 percent). Black females hardly fared better, for their unemployment rate was 12.7 percent, compared to that of 5.2 percent for white females. This suggests that African Americans continue to face difficulties in the workforce despite a tight labor market. It also suggests that while some African Americans have been the beneficiaries of more than five years of economic growth others remain excluded from the economic mainstream.

This is perhaps most evident in the Central Region, where black unemployment in 1987 was a horrific 17.7 percent. The states of Michigan and Wisconsin had black unemployment rates which nearly equalled those of the overall population during the lowest depths of the Great Depression. Black unemployment in both states exceeded twenty percent.

High unemployment for African Americans, however, was not restricted to the Central Region. Two southern states Kentucky and Louisiana, had rates above twenty percent as well. A third, Arkansas, was a mere five percentage points away. Even the Western Region state of Colorado had a frightfully high black unemployment rate (15.6 percent).

While all but two Eastern Region states had black unemployment rates that were less than ten percent (Rhode Island and Pennsylvania), the black-white unemployment rate ratio remained intolerably high. This was especially true for African American males. In Maryland and Washington, D.C., for example, black males have an unemployment rate that is more than triple that of white males. In only one state (Connecticut) do black males have an unemployment rate that is below the 34 state average (5.7 percent). In only one other state (Massachusetts) is the rate roughly equal to the overall average (6.2 percent). Clearly this has serious implications for the self-esteem of black men and the stability of African American families and communities.

Given the continued difficulty experienced by African Americans in the workforce it is not surprising that income disparity remains a salient issue. As Dr. David Swinton notes in the 1989 State of Black America, the median family income of blacks in 1987 was 56 percent of that of whites. The disparity between the races resulted in a black income gap of $107 billion, nearly half of aggregate black income. This disparity cuts across regional lines.

In each of the Urban League's geographic regions African Americans earn less overall than their white counterparts. Black workers are also concentrated in low-skilled and low-paying clerical and blue collar occupations. Income disparity was most pronounced in the Central Region, where African Americans had an average income that was 48 percent lower than that of whites. The disparity, though high, was the least pronounced in the Western Region (37 percent less). With the exception of the Western Region, roughly two-thirds of African American workers were employed in low-level clerical, laborer, or service occupations in 1987. (The corresponding figure for the Western Region was 57 percent.)

The income and occupational disparity of African Americans has serious policy implications for the current administration and future ones. While the development of policies to alleviate this disparity would contribute to an increase in the nation's gross national product, it is apparent that some in the Supreme Court and the administration view some policy remedies as undesirable. The Birmingham and Richmond cases suggest that elements of the

current regime place a higher priority on ideological rigidity than economic advancement as the best policy tool for the elimination of poverty. Their anti-civil rights crusdade will in fact prove to have negative economic consequences for Americans as a whole and people of color in particular.

The persistence of income and occupational disparity for African Americans also suggests the need to develop policies geared toward the preparation of the future workforce. Despite the development of numerous studies on the need to improve the basic skills of the American workforce, little of that has been translated into changes at the policy level. If we do not see such changes in the very near future on a grand scale, our nation may lose its window of opportunity in the creation of a workforce that is culturally diverse and productive. As is the case with the current anti-civil rights crusade, the failure to generate large scale education and skills training policy changes will result in negative economic consequences for all Americans and Americans of color in particular. The workforce of the next century will be ravaged by the same disparities of the current one.

C. ANALYSIS OF PRIORITIES

Given the current state of disparity in the American workforce and its policy implications, it should come as no surprise that **Education** and **Employment and Training** are what the Urban League perceive as being the top community needs across the country. Based on 82 of 90 affiliates who provided community needs data, the two areas remain the top-ranked concerns of communities served by affiliates. The leader and runner-up position held by these major program areas was uniform across regional lines. All told, 32 affiliates perceived **Employment and Training** to be the leading major area concern of their communities, while 23 assigned the number one position to **Education.** Other major program areas that were ranked number one included **Economic Development** (eight affiliates), **Crime/Criminal Justice** (six), **Housing** (six), **Health** (three), **Social Welfare** (three), and **Civil Rights** (two).

In terms of what Urban League affiliates believed to be the priority service areas of the local network, **Education** and **Employment and Training** were the leaders as well. However, for the first time in the history of the priorities analysis, **Education** is the leading Urban League concern. Whereas **Employment and Training** held on to its number one position in 1988 by a narrow margin of ten points, **Education** eclipsed the traditional leader by twenty points this year. This is largely due to the high ranking of **Education** by affiliates in the Eastern and Central

Regions. Of the 33 affiliates who assigned the number one rank to **Education**, 21 were in these regions. In contrast, 20 of the 37 affiliates who ranked **Employment and Training** number one were in the Southern and Western Regions.

Far behind **Employment and Training** in the number three position was **Housing**. With some 627 points, the gap between **Housing** and the runner-up was some 310 points. This may suggest that affiliates are concentrating their increasingly scarce resources on the top two major program areas. In the previous four years, the gap between the second and third ranked areas averaged 211 points and never exceeded 273.

Right behind **Housing** was **Civil Rights** and **Economic Development**, virtually tied with 604 and 603 points, respectively. **Health** was in the number six position and less than fifty points separated number seven **Social Welfare** from number nine **Community Organization**. **Citizenship Education** was in the number ten position, easily outdistancing **Energy** and **Environment**. These rankings are quite consistent with those of 1988 and other previous years.

The consistency of the major probram area rankings has led some to question the utlity and validity of an annual priorities analysis. As previously noted, the analysis does tend to corroborate concerns germane to the Urban League Movement. The consistency in the rankings schould be interpreted as confirming the persistence of certain conditions, not as the failure of the process. As the labor market analysis has demonstrated, income and occupational disparity remains a crucial concern within the African American community. The consistently high ranking of the areas of **Education** and **Employment and Training** should therefore not be a surprise. The lack of movement of other major areas merely confirms that they remain concerns critical to the African American community as well.

The sub-areas within these major areas do change somewhat over time and in some respects may be more representative of specific community and local affiliate concerns. The sub-areas identify issues that are narrow enough to shape a project or program effort. While these issues usually mirror the major area rankings, some specific concerns in the lower-ranked areas come through as well. These include **Voter Registration** in **Citizenship Education** and **Networking** in **Community Organization** in many years and **Low Income Energy Assistance** in others. Because of this, a separate analysis of the sub-areas is offered in the next section.

D. SUB-AREAS ANALYSIS

The sub-areas within the major program areas represent an important aspect of the priorities analysis that is often overlooked. The sub-areas are important because they identify important issues and target groups in need of immediate and concentrated attention. The concerns manifested by the sub-areas can contribute to the creation of a specially-funded project, lay the basis for a focused activity within a major program area, or lead to the implementation of activities aimed at community mobilization or public policy development.

A review of the 82 sub-areas reveals that **Teenage Pregnancy** remains a major concern of the Urban League Movement. **Teenage Pregnancy** has been identified as the leading sub-area since the sub-area analysis was incorporated into the Regional and National Priorities Reports in 1985. With a total of 604 points, **Teenage Pregnancy** easily outdistanced second-ranked **Low Income Energy Assistance** (534 points).

While **Teenage Pregnancy** has typically been an area of concern for the Urban League Movement, it is interesting to note that **Low Income Energy Assistance** moved up to the number two position in 1989. While this sub-area has been among the leaders in previous years, it never ranked higher than sixth. The unusually high ranking this year could suggest a greater concern about energy issues in the African American community. **Energy Assistance** also has a strong relationship to housing issues.

In the number three position this year is the sub-area of **Networking**. This represents a rise in the sub-area rankings that is almost as significant as **Low Income Energy Assistance**. Since 1986, **Networking** has been amongst the leading sub-areas, but it never assumed a ranking higher than seventh place. The extremely strong showing this year could be indicative of the impact of the Movement's public policy initiative. The building of institutional and individual networks is often a signficant precursor to the development of campaigns designed to shape legislation. **Networking** enables institutions and individuals to maximize their collective creativity without uniformity. In the public policy arena, **Networking** can help build several pressure points to affect change. This collective response to an issue is much more effective than a singular response.

Following **Networking** is the sub-area of **Family Communications, Parenting Education, and Support Services.** This item has always been amongst the leading sub-areas and reflects the Movement's longstanding concern for the family. Since its inception, the League has maintained programs designed to strengthen families and promote their self-sufficiency. In recent

years, the League has began to look seriously at the male role in the family and the Male Responsibility Program includes significant family communications and parenting education components.

Juvenile Delinquency is the fifth-leading sub-area. A member of the sub-area leaders since 1986, Juvenile Delinquency is a major concern of the League because many African American youth are caught in the quagmire of poor education, the absence of positive role models, immediate gratification, and no self-respect. The Juvenile Delinquency label merely helps describe part of a bigger problem with our youth.

Close behind Juvenile Delinquency in the rankings are Voter Registration, Crime Prevention, Voter Education, and Supporting Affordable Housing. All of these are sub-areas which have generally been included amongst the leaders. However, it is interesting to note that Voter Registration and Voter Education are making some upward movement in the rankings. Whereas Voter Registration was ranked sixth this year, it was ranked twelfth in 1988. Voter Education, tied for eighth this year, was ranked fourteenth in 1988. Like Networking, the upward movement of these sub-areas appears to be a function of the public policy initiative.

Perhaps because of the pressure of the public policy efforts, Job Placement, normally ranked fifth or higher, dropped to the number ten position in 1989. When one adds number eleven ranked Coalition Building to the discussion, it is apparent that the public policy initiative has had some immediate impact on the leading sub-areas and their position in the standings. All told, there are four leading sub-areas that can be related to public policy activities. They are Networking, Voter Education, Voter Registration and Coalition Building. In the previous years, no more than three of these sub-areas have been included in the top twelve. In contrast, this marks the first time that only one Employment and Training sub-area is included in that group.

This should not suggest that issues within the Employment and Training arena are of decreasing relevance to the Movement. What it does indicate is a future orientation of the Movement. The affiliate network has traditionally received the lion's share of its support for employment and training programs. There is nothing new about this. In contrast, the public policy initiative represents a push into an arena that the Urban League has not been a key player for several years. As noted at the Mid-Winter Meeting and the Regional Assemblies, this will be an arena that the organization intends to have significant input in the years to come.

This could also explain why no Education sub-areas were amongst the leading sub-areas. With the advent of the **Education Initiative**, funding and resource support for education has increased tremendously in the Movement overall. Furthermore, local school systems have become greater sensitized to the needs of inner-city students. While the internal and external resources may not be sufficient to meet student and societal needs, they far exceed what was available in the past. Consequently, it becomes imperative for the affiliate network to look ahead to other areas where the resource gap, monetary and otherwise, remains considerable.

Given this rationale, it is not difficult to understand why the issues of **AIDS** and **Substance Abuse** remain leading sub-areas. The resources to contend with both concerns is woefully inadequate relative to their impact on the African American population. Given the tremendous need in both areas, African Americans receive significantly less than a fair share of the resources available. The need for resource equity in these areas may lead to greater advocacy in the legislative arena and more visible community organization efforts.

Among the high ranking sub-areas not included in the top fifteen are **Entrepreneurship Training and Development** (446 points), **Government Enforcement of Civil Rights Law** (431), **Small Business Assistance and Development** (430), and **Increased Minority Participation in Energy Issues** (425). Rounding out the top fifteen are **Community Based Economic Planning** and **Developing Employment Opportunities.** The presence of **Community Based Economic Planning** marks the first time that an Economic Development sub-area has been among the leaders.

E. BROAD AREAS FOR ADOPTION

Based on the methods used to compile this data, the analysis presented in the discussion, and a review of the information contained in the proceeding tables, the following should be considered and adopted as the priorities for the Urban League Movement:

1. EDUCATION
2. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING
3. HOUSING
4. CIVIL RIGHTS
5. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
6. HEALTH
7. SOCIAL WELFARE
8. CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE
9. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
10. CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION
11. ENERGY
12. ENVIRONMENT

vvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvv

AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

CENTRAL REGION

ALTON, ILLINOIS
ANDERSON, INDIANA
AURORA, ILLINOIS
BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN
CANTON, OHIO
CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
CLEVELAND, OHIO
CINCINNATI, OHIO
COLUMBUS, OHIO
DETROIT, MICHIGAN
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA
LANSING, MICHIGAN
LORAIN, OHIO
MADISON, WISCONSIN
MARION, INDIANA
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
MUSKEGON, MICHIGAN
OMAHA, NEBRASKA
PEORIA, ILLINOIS
PONTIAC, MICHIGAN
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO
WARREN-TRUMBULL, OHIO
WICHITA, KANSAS
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

T=29

AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

EASTERN REGION

ALBANY, NEW YORK
AMITYVILLE, NEW YORK
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
BUFFALO, NEW YORK
ELIZABETH, NEW JERSEY
ENGLEWOOD, NEW JERSEY
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
SHENANGO VALLEY, PA
SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS
SYRACUSE, NEW YORK
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY
WASHINGTON, DC

T-22

AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

SOUTHERN REGION

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
AUSTIN, TEXAS
BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA
CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBUS, GEORGIA
DALLAS, TEXAS
FT. LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA
HOUSTON, TEXAS
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
KNOXVILLE, TENESSEE
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
MIAMI, FLORIDA
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
TAMPA, FLORIDA
TULSA, OKLAHOMA
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

T=28

NOTE: The Winston-Salem affiliate was conducting a needs assessment at the time this analysis was initiated. The results of that needs assessment were received in time for inclusion in the 1989 National Priorities Report.

AFFILIATES PARTICIPATING IN THE 1989 NATIONAL PRIORITIES REPORT

WESTERN REGION

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
DENVER, COLORADO
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
PORTLAND, OREGON
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND, CA
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
TACOMA, WASHINGTON

T-11

A P P E N D I C E S

TABLE 1

NATIONAL TALLY FOR COMMUNITY NEEDS, 1989
(BASED ON 82 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	890
EDUCATION	2	836
HOUSING	3	668
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	4	624
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	5	563
HEALTH	6	538
CIVIL RIGHTS	7*	491
SOCIAL WELFARE	7*	491
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	406
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	293
ENERGY	11	213
ENVIRONMENT	12	194

*Denotes tied rankings

NPED: 6/89 vew

TABLE 2

NATIONAL TALLY FOR URBAN LEAGUE RANKINGS, 1989
(BASED ON 88 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EDUCATION	1	957
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	2	937
HOUSING	3	627
CIVIL RIGHTS	4	604
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	5	603
HEALTH	6	571
SOCIAL WELFARE	7	530
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	8	498
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	496
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	417
ENERGY	11	174
ENVIRONMENT	12	156

NPED: 6/89 vew

TABLE 3

CENTRAL REGION
FINAL TALLY ON COMMUNITY NEEDS
(BASED ON 27 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	290
EDUCATION	2	263
HOUSING	3	239
HEALTH	4	215
CIVIL RIGHTS	5	189
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	6	188
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	7	178
SOCIAL WELFARE	8	171
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	160
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	102
ENERGY	11	82
ENVIRONMENT	12	54

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 4

CENTRAL REGION
FINAL TALLY ON URBAN LEAGUE RANKINGS
(BASED ON 29 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EDUCATION	1	322
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	2	296
HOUSING	3	228
HEALTH	4	224
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	5	212
SOCIAL WELFARE	6	197
CIVIL RIGHTS	7	194
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	8	192
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	9	171
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	139
ENERGY	11	70
ENVIRONMENT	12	45

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 5

EASTERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON COMMUNITY NEEDS
(BASED ON 20 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	210
HOUSING	2	194
EDUCATION	3	189
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	4	166
HEALTH	5	141
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	6	129
CIVIL RIGHTS	7	114
SOCIAL WELFARE	8	110
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	98
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	72
ENERGY	11	67
ENVIRONMENT	12	63

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 6

EASTERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON URBAN LEAGUE RANKINGS
(BASED ON 21 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EDUCATION	1	224
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	2	215
HOUSING	3	184
HEALTH	4	150
CIVIL RIGHTS	5	141
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	6	130
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	7	125
SOCIAL WELFARE	8	119
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	9	112
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	10	111
ENERGY	11	54
ENVIRONMENT	12	50

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 7

SOUTHERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON COMMUNITY NEEDS
(BASED ON 24 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	261
EDUCATION	2	254
HOUSING	3	197
SOCIAL WELFARE	4	189
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	5	157
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	6	149
HEALTH	7	123
CIVIL RIGHTS	8	107
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	78
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	60
ENERGY	11	49
ENVIRONMENT	12	34

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 8

SOUTHERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON URBAN LEAGUE RANKINGS
(BASED ON 27 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	293
EDUCATION	2	288
HOUSING	3	191
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	4	180
SOCIAL WELFARE	5	172
CIVIL RIGHTS	6	163
HEALTH	7	156
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	8	130
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	9	127
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	99
ENERGY	11*	41
ENVIRONMENT	11*	41

*Denotes tied rankings.

TABLE 9

WESTERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON COMMUNITY NEEDS
(BASED ON 11 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	119
EDUCATION	2	116
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	3	90
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	4	86
CIVIL RIGHTS	5	71
HEALTH	6	64
HOUSING	7	62
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	8	59
SOCIAL WELFARE	9	46
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	45
ENVIRONMENT	11	29
ENERGY	12	21

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 10

WESTERN REGION
FINAL TALLY ON URBAN LEAGUE RANKINGS
(BASED ON 11 RESPONDING AFFILIATES)
1989

MAJOR PROGRAM AREA	RANK	POINTS
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	1	124
EDUCATION	2	122
CIVIL RIGHTS	3	88
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	4	80
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE	5	74
HEALTH	6*	58
SOCIAL WELFARE	6*	58
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	8	57
HOUSING	9	53
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	10	52
ENVIRONMENT	11	18
ENERGY	12	15

*Denotes tied rankings

NPED: 6/89 VEW

TABLE 11

THE LEADING SUB-AREAS FOR 1989

SUB-AREA (BROAD AREA)	RANK	POINTS
TEENAGE PREGNANCY (Social Welfare)	1	604
LOW INCOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE (Energy)	2	534
NETWORKING (Community Organiztion)	3	510
FAMILY COMMUNICTIONS, PARENT EDUCATION, AND SUPPORT SERVICES (Social Welfare)	4	504
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY (Crime/Criminal Justice)	5	477
VOTER REGISTRATION (Citizenship Education)	6	474
CRIME PREVENTION (Crime/Criminal Justice)	7	472
SUPPORTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING (Housing)	8*	469
VOTER EDUCATION (Citizenship Education)	8*	469
JOB PLACEMENT (Employment and Training)	10	467
COALITION BUILDING (Community Organization)	11	466
SUBSTANCE ABUSE (Health)	12	464
AIDS PREVENTION AND EDUCATION (Health)	13	463
COMMUNITY BASED ECONOMIC PLANNING (Economic Development)	14	462
DEVELOPING JOB OPPORTUNITIES (Employment and Training)	15	450

*Denotes tied rankings

TABLE 12

1989 NATIONAL PRIORITY RANKINGS
URBAN LEAGUE PRIORITY RANKINGS
BY BROAD AREA AND SUB-AREA

AREA	RANK	TOTAL POINTS
EDUCATION	1	
Early Childhood Development	1	390
Remedial and Basic Skills Tutoring	2*	384
Drop-Outs/Push-Outs	2*	384
Academic Preparation	4	360
Parental Involvement	5	344
High Achievers	6	164
Desegration	7	131
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	2	
Job Placement	1	467
Developing Employment Opportunities	2	450
Pre-Employment Skills	3	370
Occupational Skills Training	4	358
EEO/Affirmative Action	5	313
Target Population Training	6	278
World of Work Orientation	7	231

*Denotes tied rankings

HOUSING	3	
Supporting Affordable Housing	1	469
Housing Counseling	2	394
Homelessness	3	358
Neighborhood Revitalization	4	329
Fair Housing	5	326
Housing Rehabilitation	6	307
CIVIL RIGHTS	4	
Government Enforcement	1	431
Support for Legislation	2	424
Institutional Compliance	3	383
Immigration Reform	4	186
Judicial Nominations	5	283
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	5	
Community Based Economic Planning	1	462
Entrepreneurship Training and Development	2	446
Small Business Assistance and Development	3	430
Affiliate Business Development	4	265

HEALTH	6	
Substance Abuse	1	464
AIDS Prevention and Education	2	463
Health Fairs, Health Care Information and Referral	3	369
Hypertension/High Blood Pressure Screening	4	356
Nutrition Education/WIC	5	304
Mental Health Care	6	292
Medicaid, Medicare, Health Care Insurance	7	285
Advocacy for Public Hospitals	8	255
SOCIAL WELFARE	7	
Teenage Pregnancy	1	604
Family Communications, Parent Education	2	504
Youth Services	3	362
Income Benefits, Services, and Supports	4	355
Child Supervision-Day Care and After School	5	353
Domestic Violence	6	247
CRIME/CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	8	
Juvenile Delinquency	1	477
Crime Prevention	2	472
Police - Community Relations	3	428
Racially-Motivated Violence	4	288
Corrections	5	280
Courts	6	238

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION	9	
Networking	1	510
Coalition Building	2	466
Information and Referral	3	403
Community Planning	4	397
Capacity Building	5	302
CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION	10	
Voter Registration	1	469
Voter Education	2	469
Getting Out The Vote	3	393
Leadership Development	4	359
Citizen Participation	5	351
Volunteer Development	6	238
ENERGY	11	
Low Income Energy Assistance	1	534
Increase Minority Participation	2	425
Weatherization Assistance	3	381
Energy Education	4	367
Research	5	171
ENVIRONMENT	12	
Environmental Education	1	353
Environmental Health Hazards	2	344
Land Use Management	3	318
Research	4	238

NPED: 6/89 vew